

## REMARKS

Claims 12-23 are pending in the present application. By this amendment, claims 12-15 and 17-22 have been amended to remove language that may create a presumption that step-plus-function treatment under §112, paragraph six, would be accorded any of the claimed elements.

Claim 23 has been added and support for elements in this claim not previously found in the previously presented claims may be found on page 4 of the specification.

In the present Office Action, claims 12-22 have been rejected. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in light of the following remarks. Claims 12-22 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonsson in view of Kellar et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

With respect to independent claim 12, this claim features “transmitting a service call from a calling party via a first mobile switching center in a first subnetwork to a home location register in a second subnetwork.” In contrast, Jonsson merely describes a method where a connection is set up between a PBX and another terminal device, the connection set-up being controlled by a different mobile radio device or by the PBX itself. (See, e.g., column 1, lines 56-61 and column 4, lines 1-5). In Figure 4 of Jonsson, which has been specifically referenced in the present Office Action, the taught system merely teaches transmitting a service call from a mobile station 90 to a mobile switching center 120 within the same subnetwork. No teaching or suggestion is given by Jonsson that the mobile station 90 and the mobile switching center 120 are located in different subnetworks. Accordingly, Jonsson does not provide teaching or suggestion of all of the claimed elements. Furthermore, Keller et al. does not provide any teaching or suggestion to cure the deficiency of Jonsson. Accordingly, the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 12 and, thus, this claim is not obvious in view of this art.

With respect to dependent claims 13-22, these claims are believed to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 12.


With respect to new independent claim 23, the Applicants respectfully submits that the features of this claim are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. Accordingly, this claim is believed to be allowable.

In light of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY

  
Patrick B. Law

Reg. No. 41,549

P.O. Box 1135

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

Phone: (312) 781-6801

Dated: November 25, 2003